

On Limited Non-Prioritised Belief Revision Operators with Dynamic Scope

Kai Sauerwald¹, Gabriele Kern-Isberner², Christoph Beierle¹

¹FernUniversität in Hagen, 58084 Hagen, Germany

²TU Dortmund University, 44227 Dortmund, Germany

Abstract

The research on non-prioritized revision studies revision operators which do not accept all new beliefs. In this paper, we contribute to this line of research by introducing the concept of dynamic-limited revision, which are revisions expressible by a total preorder over a limited set of worlds. For a belief change operator, we consider the scope, which consists of those beliefs which yield success of revision. We show that for each set satisfying single sentence closure and disjunction completeness there exists a dynamic-limited revision having the union of this set with the beliefs set as scope. We investigate iteration postulates for belief and scope dynamics and characterise them for dynamic-limited revision. As an application, we employ dynamic-limited revision to studying belief revision in the context of so-called inherent beliefs, which are beliefs globally accepted by the agent. This leads to revision operators which we call inherence-limited. We present a representation theorem for inherence-limited revision, and we compare these operators and dynamic-limited revision with the closely related credible-limited revision operators.

1 Introduction

The AGM-approach is the most prominent approach to revision (Alchourrón, Gärdenfors and Makinson, 1985). This approach has been extended to the iterative case by Darwiche and Pearl (1997), who proposed to consider belief change over epistemic states and showed for iterated revision, that for revision in that framework every epistemic state has to be equipped with a total preorder over all possible worlds. At least since then, total preorders are one of most important representation formalisms for iterated change. However, a potentially undesired behaviour of AGM revision is that it always accepts all new beliefs unquestioned. As an alternative, the area of non-prioritized revision provides revision operators which do not accept all beliefs. A lot of work has been done on non-prioritized change over epistemic states, e.g. improvement operators (Konieczny and Pino Pérez 2008; Konieczny, Grespan, and Pino Pérez 2010; Schwind and Konieczny 2020), credibility-limited revision (Booth et al. 2012; Booth et al. 2014), core-revision (Booth 2002), and decrement operators (Sauerwald and Beierle 2019); and even more on non-prioritized change in other change frameworks, e.g. (Hansson 1999; Hansson et al. 2001; Garapa, Fermé, and Reis 2018).

A successful model of non-prioritized revision are credibility-limited revision operators, limiting the revision process to so-called credible beliefs. In particular, in the approach by Booth et al. (Booth et al. 2012; Booth et al. 2014) all beliefs of a belief set are considered as credible beliefs. As a consequence, credibility-limited revision operators are characterizable by total preorders over the models of the belief set and further interpretations, but not necessarily over all possible worlds.

In this paper, we seize on the idea of credible-limited revision in the framework of Darwiche and Pearl and propose a more radical version which maintains semantically a total preorder over an arbitrary subset of all possible worlds. We denote these operators as dynamic-limited revision operators, which will behave similarly to credibility-limited revision (Booth et al. 2012): when new beliefs arrive, then we accept this belief when it shares models with the domain of the total preorder, otherwise we keep the prior belief sets.

The motivation to investigate these operators is twofold. First, we think that not all beliefs in a belief set might be reasonable beliefs in a strong sense. This is due to various unreliable sources of beliefs, like sensors. Clearly, a revision operator should, if possible, yield a belief set that could be considered reasonable. However, when it comes to (iterative) revision the initial beliefs might not only contain reasonable beliefs. Belief revision should also deal with such situations. Second, representing a total preorder over all interpretations of the underlying logic comes with high representational costs and is for larger signatures infeasible, as the number of interpretations grows exponentially with the size of the signature. Thus, it is desirable to investigate approaches to reduce these representational costs.

We define dynamic-limited revision operators semantically by having three components for every epistemic state Ψ : a belief set $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$, a set of worlds \mathcal{S}_Ψ and a total preorder \preceq_Ψ over \mathcal{S}_Ψ . Note that for dynamic-limited revision operators, $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$ and \preceq_Ψ are not as strongly coupled as for credibility-limited revision operators. Thus, changes by dynamic-limited revision operators are three-dimensional. One dimension is the change on the set of beliefs, the second is the change of order of elements in \preceq_Ψ , and the third is the change of \mathcal{S}_Ψ . The set \mathcal{S}_Ψ describes semantically what beliefs are get accepted for revision. Because \mathcal{S}_Ψ is a semantic component, we characterise this set syntactically. This will lead to new postulates and a representation theorem for

dynamic-limited revision operators.

To investigate what impact a change from \mathcal{S}_Ψ to $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \circ \alpha}$ has, we consider the interrelation between \mathcal{S}_Ψ and the syntactic concept of *scope*. A belief α is in the scope, if α is believed after a revision by α . Thus, the scope does not conceptualise the beliefs which are credible in the sense of credibility-limited revision, it describes the beliefs that are acceptable for a revision. To motivate the relevance of the scope consider the following example.

Example 1. *Imagine an agent who initially believes $\alpha \vee \beta$, e.g. α stands¹ for “Karl is a camel with one hump” and β “Karl is a camel with two humps”. Now the agent starts an iterative revision process to get clear about the state of $\alpha \vee \beta$. Let assume our agent receives the information β . In this initial stage of the iterative revision process, the agent might be open-minded, and a revision by β might be successful, i.e. the agent now believes β . But, when receiving afterwards a belief γ which is contrary to β , then it is plausible that the agent does not accept the belief γ (the belief γ is not acceptable for a revision, thus not part of the scope). For instance, γ could state “Karl has no hump”.*

Changing the scope in an iterative setting has gained less explicit attention and the investigations in this paper are just a first step, where dynamic-limited revision operators enable us to talk about that phenomenon. The only work we know is due to Booth et al. (2012) for credibility-limited revisions. We consider postulates for scope dynamics from their work and introduce additional postulates.

As an application of dynamic-limited revision operators, we propose agents that are narrowed to a restricted set of basal beliefs when it comes to a revision, and moreover, only accept new beliefs that are rooted in these basal beliefs. We formalize the basal beliefs as beliefs that get accepted with all its consequences regardless of the current epistemic state and call them inherent beliefs. The disjunction of inherent beliefs yields what we call immanent beliefs. Upon these notions, we introduce inherence-limited revision operators, which are operators yielding either a set of immanent beliefs or keep the old belief sets. We give a representation theorem for inherence-limited revision in the framework of epistemic states, by employing dynamic-limited revision operators. We show that inherence-limited revision corresponds to maintain a total preorder over a subset of possible worlds, where the set of possible worlds is the same for all epistemic states. We investigate the role of inherent and immanent beliefs for AGM, dynamic-limited and credibility-limited revision operators.

In summary, the main contributions of this paper are:²

- Introduction of dynamic-limited revision and inherence-limited revision.
- Introduction and investigation of postulates for the dynamics of scope and their characterisation for dynamic-limited revision.

The paper is organised as follows. In the next section we start with the background. In Section 2 we introduce the

¹Thanks to Diana Howey, who gave inspiration to this example.

²We have proofs for all results, but due to space limitations, the proofs are presented in the supplementary material.

background from logic and iterated belief change. Section 3 defines the concept of scope and introduces several iteration postulates. Dynamic-limited revision operators are introduced in Section 4. In Section 5 we syntactically characterise the component \mathcal{S}_Ψ of dynamic-limited revision operators. Postulates and a full representation theorem for dynamic-limited revision operators are given in Section 6. We investigate the iterative dynamics of dynamic-limited revision operators in Section 7 by giving characterisation theorems for various iteration principles. Section 8 introduces inherence-limited revision operators and we give a representation theorem. The article closes with a conclusion in Section 9.

2 Formal Background

We start by presenting the logical background.

Propositional Logic and Preorders Let $\Sigma = \{a, b, c, \dots\}$ be a propositional signature (non empty finite set of propositional variables) and \mathcal{L} a propositional language over Σ . With lower Greek letters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots$ we denote formulas in \mathcal{L} . The set of propositional interpretations is denoted by Ω . We write elements from Ω as sequences of all propositional variables, where overlining denotes assignment to *false*, e.g., in \overline{abc} the variable a is evaluated to false (and b, c to *true*). Propositional entailment is denoted by \models , the set of models of α with $\text{Mod}(\alpha)$, and $\text{Cn}(\alpha) = \{\beta \mid \alpha \models \beta\}$ is the deductive closure of α . For a set X , we define $\text{Cn}(X) = \{\beta \mid X \models \beta\}$, and the expansion of X by α as $X + \alpha = \text{Cn}(X \cup \{\alpha\})$. By $\varphi_{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k}$ we denote a formula such that $\text{Mod}(\varphi_{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k}) = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k\}$. For two set of worlds $\Omega', \Omega'' \subseteq \Omega$ and a total preorder $\preceq \subseteq \Omega' \times \Omega'$ (total, reflexive and transitive relation) over Ω' , we denote with $\text{dom}(\preceq) = \Omega'$ the domain of \preceq and with $\min(\Omega'', \preceq) = \{\omega \in \text{dom}(\preceq) \mid \omega \preceq \omega' \text{ for all } \omega' \in \text{dom}(\preceq) \cap \Omega''\}$ the set of all \preceq -minimal worlds of Ω'' in $\text{dom}(\preceq)$. For a total preorder \preceq , we define $x \prec y$ iff $x \preceq y$ and $y \not\preceq x$. As convention, we use \leq for total preorders over Ω and \preceq for total preorders over (potentially strict) subsets of Ω .

Epistemic States Classical belief change theory (Alchourrón, Gärdenfors, and Makinson 1985) deals with belief sets as representation of belief states, i.e., deductively closed sets of propositions. The area of iterated belief change abstracts from belief sets to *epistemic states* (Darwiche and Pearl 1997), in which the agent maintains necessary information for all available belief change operators. With \mathcal{E} we denote the set of all epistemic states over \mathcal{L} . In general, the Darwiche and Pearl framework has no further requirements on \mathcal{E} , except that every epistemic state $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$ is equipped with a set of plausible sentences $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, which is assumed to be deductively closed.

In certain cases we will require more structure on \mathcal{E} . Therefore, we propose the follow principle for the set of epistemic states:

if $L \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ and L is consistent, then

there exists $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\text{Cn}(L) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ (unbiased)

where (unbiased) guarantees that for every consistent belief set there exists at least one corresponding epistemic state.

Another common assumption is consistency of every belief set; we express this by the following principle:

if $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \neq \text{Cn}(\perp)$ (global consistency)

We write $\Psi \models \alpha$ iff $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ and we define $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\text{Bel}(\Psi))$. A *belief change operator* over \mathcal{E} (and \mathcal{L}) is a function $\circ : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$.

Belief Revision in Epistemic States Revision deals with the problem of incorporating new beliefs into an agent's belief set, in a consistent way, whenever that is possible. The well-known approach to revision given by AGM (Alchourrón, Gärdenfors, and Makinson 1985) has a counterpart in the framework of epistemic states. Darwiche and Pearl (Darwiche and Pearl 1997) propose that an epistemic state Ψ should be equipped with a total preorder \leq_Ψ of the worlds, where the compatibility with $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$ is ensured by the so-called faithfulness.

Definition 1 (Darwiche and Pearl 1997). A function $\Psi \mapsto \leq_\Psi$ that maps each epistemic state to a total preorder on interpretations is said to be a *faithful assignment* if:

(FA1) if $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ and $\omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\omega_1 \simeq_\Psi \omega_2$

(FA2) if $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ and $\omega_2 \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\omega_1 <_\Psi \omega_2$

Intuitively, \leq_Ψ orders the worlds by plausibility, such that the minimal worlds are the most plausible worlds. The connection to revision is given as follows.

Proposition 2 (Darwiche and Pearl 1997). A belief change operator $*$ is an AGM revision operator for epistemic states if there is a faithful assignment $\Psi \mapsto \leq_\Psi$ such that:

$$\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \leq_\Psi) \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we say that a belief change operator is an AGM revision operator if it is an AGM revision operator for epistemic states.

Credibility-Limited Revision in Epistemic States

The central idea of credibility-limited revision (Hansson et al. 2001) is to restrict the process of revision such that a revision is only performed when the agent receives a credible belief. Credibility-limited revision operators for the framework of epistemic states were introduced by Booth, Fermé, Konieczny and Pino Pérez (Booth et al. 2012) as operators obeying the following postulates.

Definition 3 (Booth et al. 2012). A belief change operator \circledast is a credibility-limited revision operator if \circledast satisfies:

(CL1) $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha)$ or $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$

(CL2) if $\text{Bel}(\Psi) + \alpha$ is consistent, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) + \alpha$

(CL3) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha)$ is consistent

(CL4) if $\alpha \equiv \beta$, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \beta)$

(CL5) if $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha)$ and $\alpha \models \beta$, then $\beta \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \beta)$

(CL6) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \begin{cases} \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha) \text{ or} \\ \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \beta) \text{ or} \\ \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \alpha) \cap \text{Bel}(\Psi \circledast \beta) \end{cases}$

The postulate (CL1) is known as relative success and denotes that either nothing happens or the belief change is successful in achieving the success condition of revision. Through (CL2), known as vacuity, new beliefs are just added

when they are not in conflict with $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$. The postulate (CL3) ensures consistency, and by (CL4) the operator has to implement independence of syntax. Postulate (CL5) guarantees that when the revision by a belief α is successful, then it is also successful for every more general belief β . The trichotomy postulate (CL6) guarantees decomposability of revision of disjunctive beliefs.

Booth, Fermé, Konieczny and Pino Pérez (Booth et al. 2012) provide the following variation of faithful assignment to capture the class of credibility-limited revision operators.

Definition 4 (CLF-assignment (Booth et al. 2012)). A function $\Psi \mapsto (\leq_\Psi, C_\Psi)$ is a *credibility-limited faithful assignment* (CLF-assignment) if C_Ψ is a set of interpretations such that $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \subseteq C_\Psi \subseteq \Omega$ and \leq_Ψ is a total preorder over C_Ψ such that $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \min(C_\Psi, \leq_\Psi)$.

Booth, Fermé, Konieczny and Pino Pérez showed that CLF-assignments are completely able to capture credibility-limited revisions (Booth et al. 2012, Thm. 2).

Proposition 5 (Booth et al. 2012). Assume global consistency for \mathcal{E} . A belief change operator \circledast is a credibility-limited revision operator if and only if there is a CLF-assignment $\Psi \mapsto \leq_\Psi$ such that the following holds:

$$\text{Mod}(\Psi \circledast \alpha) = \begin{cases} \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \leq_\Psi) & , \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap C_\Psi \neq \emptyset \\ \text{Mod}(\Psi) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{CLR})$$

3 Scope and Iteration Principles

In this section we present different iteration principles and introduce the notion of scope.

Iterated Revision. When considering iterative revision, the most well-known work is due to Darwiche and Pearl (Darwiche and Pearl 1997). Driven by the insight that iteration needs additional constraints, Darwiche and Pearl proposed the following postulates:

(DP1) if $\beta \models \alpha$, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha * \beta) = \text{Bel}(\Psi * \beta)$

(DP2) if $\beta \models \neg\alpha$, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha * \beta) = \text{Bel}(\Psi * \beta)$

(DP3) if $\Psi * \beta \models \alpha$, then $(\Psi * \alpha) * \beta \models \alpha$

(DP4) if $\Psi * \beta \not\models \neg\alpha$, then $(\Psi * \alpha) * \beta \not\models \neg\alpha$

It is well-known that these operators can be characterised in the semantic framework of total preorders.

Proposition 6 ((Darwiche and Pearl 1997)). Let $*$ be an AGM revision operator for epistemic states. Then $*$ satisfies (DP1) to (DP4) if and only if there exists a faithful assignment $\Psi \mapsto \leq_\Psi$ such that (1) and the following is satisfied:

(CR8) if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\alpha)$, then $\omega_1 \leq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \leq_{\Psi * \alpha} \omega_2$

(CR9) if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)$, then $\omega_1 \leq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \leq_{\Psi * \alpha} \omega_2$

(CR10) if $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and $\omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)$, then $\omega_1 <_\Psi \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 <_{\Psi * \alpha} \omega_2$

(CR11) if $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and $\omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)$, then $\omega_1 \leq_\Psi \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 \leq_{\Psi * \alpha} \omega_2$

Scope. We define the concept of a scope as those beliefs which are accepted after a revision.

Definition 7. Let \circ be a belief change operator and Ψ an epistemic state. The scope of \circ with respect to Ψ is the set:

$$Scp^\circ(\Psi) = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{L} \mid \alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha)\}$$

Note that the concept is not novel, and has been introduced before in the context of credibility-limited revision (Booth et al. 2012) with the notion $C_\circ(\Psi)$. In this context, the context of credibility-limited revision, it has been shown to describe the set of credible beliefs. However, for operators we investigate in this paper, the set $Scp^\circ(\Psi)$ might contain elements that someone may not describe as credible beliefs. This gives rationale for choosing a different notation here.

AGM Revision and Scope. To get an impression what $Scp^\circ(\Psi)$ express, remember that every AGM revision operator accepts every new belief without doubt. Consequently, the scope of an AGM revision contains all elements of the logical language.

Proposition 8. For every AGM revision operator $*$ we have $Scp^*(\Psi) = \mathcal{L}$ for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$.

Credibility-Limited Revision: Scope and Iteration Principles. To describe the scope of belief change operators we will make use of conditions (Hansson et al. 2001) for a set of formulas X :

if $\alpha \vee \beta \in X$, then $\alpha \in X$ or $\beta \in X$
(disjunction completeness)

if $\alpha \in X$ and $\alpha \models \beta$, then $\beta \in X$ (single-sentence closure)

When it comes to the class of credibility-limited revision operators, we see a much wider variety of different scopes. For this class, the scope is given by single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness.

Proposition 9. Let Ψ be an epistemic state. The following statements hold:

- (a) If \circledast is a credibility-limited revision operator, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \subseteq Scp^{\circledast}(\Psi)$, and $Scp^{\circledast}(\Psi)$ satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness.
- (b) For each $X \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \subseteq X$, and X satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness, there exists a credibility-limited revision operator \circledast such that $Scp^{\circledast}(\Psi) = X$.

In the research on credibility-limited revision operators, the dynamics of $Scp^\circ(\Psi)$ was investigated. In particular, different iteration postulation principles were considered by Booth et al. (2012), which we rephrase in the following in our notation.

(CLDP1) if $\beta \models \alpha$ and $\beta \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$,
then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha \circ \beta) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \beta)$

(CLDP2) if $\beta \models \neg\alpha$ and $\alpha, \beta \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$,
then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha \circ \beta) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \beta)$

The postulates (CLDP1) and (CLDP2) are meant as an analogue to (DP1) and (DP2) for credibility-limited revision.

(CLP) $\neg\alpha \notin \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \beta)$ and $\alpha, \beta \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$,
then $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha \circ \beta)$

(CLCD) if $\beta \models \neg\alpha$ and $\beta \notin Scp^\circ(\Psi)$ and $\alpha \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$,
then $\beta \notin Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha)$

The postulate (CLP) corresponds to the postulate P by Booth and Meyer (Booth and Meyer 2006), respectively the independence condition by Jin and Thielscher (2007). Coherence of credible formulas is maintained by the postulate (CLCD). Furthermore, the following two postulates were introduced:

(CM1) if $\beta \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$ and $\beta \models \alpha$, then $\beta \in Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha)$
(Credibility Monotony 1)

(CM2) if $\alpha, \beta \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$ and $\beta \models \neg\alpha$, then $\beta \in Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha)$
(Credibility Monotony 2)

(CM1) states that when changing by α , the scope retains all beliefs more specific than α . The postulate (CM2) makes the same claim about the beliefs more specific than $\neg\alpha$.

For further explanation, the interrelation and characterisations of these postulates we refer to the original paper (Booth et al. 2012).

Further Iteration Principles By employing the notion of scope, we define further attitudes towards the acceptance of beliefs when iterating.

(FC) if $\alpha \notin Scp^\circ(\Psi)$, then $Scp^\circ(\Psi) \subseteq Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha)$
(failure conservatism)

(FR) if $\alpha \notin Scp^\circ(\Psi)$, then $Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha) \subseteq Scp^\circ(\Psi)$
(failure reticence)

The postulates (FC) (respectively (FR)) states that when a belief is not accepted, that set of beliefs which get accepted does not decrease (respectively increases). For success of revision, we provide the following analogue postulates:

(SC) if $\alpha \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$, then $Scp^\circ(\Psi) \subseteq Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha)$
(success conservatism)

(SR) if $\alpha \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$, then $Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha) \subseteq Scp^\circ(\Psi)$
(success reticence)

The postulates (FC) to (SR) are relatively unspecific with respect to the scope, thus we provide, in the fashion of (CM1) and (CM2) the following two postulates:

(DOC) if $\alpha \in Scp^\circ(\Psi)$ and $\beta \models \neg\alpha$, then $\beta \notin Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha)$
(denial of contrary)

(COM) if $\alpha \notin Scp^\circ(\Psi)$, then $\alpha \in Scp^\circ(\Psi \circ \alpha)$
(change of mind)

By (DOC) we express the attitude to refuse beliefs contrary to a just accepted belief. The postulates (COM) expresses that refusal of a belief leads to acceptance of this belief in the subsequent situation.

4 Dynamic-Limited Revision

We now adapt the machinery of Darwiche and Pearl (Darwiche and Pearl 1997) by employing ideas from credibility-limited revision to operators that maintain a total preorder only over a limited set of worlds. In particular, we start by restricting the total preorder in assignments to \mathcal{S}_Ψ , a subset of Ω . The set \mathcal{S}_Ψ is supposed to hold the models of beliefs from the scope which are not in $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$.

Definition 10. A mapping $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$ is called a limited assignment if for each epistemic state Ψ the relation \preceq_Ψ is a total preorder with³ $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \text{dom}(\preceq_\Psi) \subseteq \Omega$.

³Note: In principle we could permit the emptiness of \mathcal{S}_Ψ , but due to space restrictions we focus on the non-empty case.

Note that \mathcal{S}_Ψ depends on the state, thus, for each state Ψ the set \mathcal{S}_Ψ might be a completely different subset from Ω .

As $\text{Mod}(\Psi)$ and \mathcal{S}_Ψ in general do not share the same interpretations, we adapt the concept of faithfulness.

Definition 11. A limited assignment $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$ is called faithful if for each Ψ we have:

$$\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \min(\mathcal{S}_\Psi, \preceq_\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$

This faithfulness condition states that minimal elements of \preceq_Ψ are models of Ψ (if $\text{Mod}(\Psi)$ shares elements with \mathcal{S}_Ψ), but $\min(\mathcal{S}_\Psi, \preceq_\Psi)$ does *not* necessarily contains all models of Ψ . Clearly, limited assignments are a generalisation of Darwiche and Pearl's assignments (c.f. Definition 1), because if $\mathcal{S}_\Psi = \Omega$ for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$, then a (faithful) limited assignment is a (faithful) assignment.

We link limited assignments and belief change operators similar to the approaches of credibility-limited revision in Proposition 5 by defining a notion of compatibility (Falakh, Rudolph, and Sauerwald 2021).

Definition 12. A limited assignment $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$ is called compatible with a belief change operator \star if it is faithful and the following holds:

$$\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \begin{cases} \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi), & \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \neq \emptyset \\ \text{Mod}(\Psi) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(limited-revision)

Operators captured by this machinery are called dynamic-limited revision operators.

Definition 13. A belief change operator \star is called a dynamic-limited revision operator if it is compatible with some limited assignment.

Note that even in the sense of the original definition by Hansson et. al (2001), dynamic-limited revision is not a form of credibility-limited revision. Moreover, in the framework of Darwiche and Pearl, dynamic-limited revision is a generalisation of credibility-limited revision.

Corollary 14. Every credibility-limited revision operator is a dynamic-limited revision operator. Furthermore, there is a dynamic-limited revision operator that is not a credibility-limited revision operator.

We give an example for dynamic-limited revision.

Example 2. Consider again the agent from Example 1 and Karl the camel. We express this example by the means of dynamic-limited revision operators. Therefore, let $\Sigma = \{z, o, t\}$ be a propositional signature with the following intended meaning: z stands for ‘‘Karl has Zero humps’’, o stands for ‘‘Karl has One hump’’ and t stands for ‘‘Karl has Two humps’’. Remember that our agent believes initially $o \vee t$. We decide to model the initial state Ψ as follows: let $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \{\bar{z}o\bar{t}, \bar{z}o\bar{t}, \bar{z}o\bar{t}\}$ and let $\mathcal{S}_\Psi = \{z\bar{o}\bar{t}, \bar{z}o\bar{t}, \bar{z}o\bar{t}\}$ and $\bar{z}o\bar{t} \simeq_\Psi \bar{z}o\bar{t} \prec_\Psi z\bar{o}\bar{t}$. The rationale for the choice of \mathcal{S}_Ψ is that z, o, t semantically exclude each other, and we think a belief revision operator should cover only (semantically) reasonable worlds.

When revising Ψ by $\beta = t$, then $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta) = \{\bar{z}o\bar{t}\}$ by the machinery defined in this section. Clearly, we could choose $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \beta}$. However, by following Example 1, we choose $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \beta} = \{\bar{z}o\bar{t}\}$. This decision corresponds to the conception

of the postulate (DOC). Now, when revising by $\gamma = o$ the operator \star denies this belief (because $\text{Mod}(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \beta} = \emptyset$), and yields $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta) = \{\bar{z}o\bar{t}\}$. This complies with the behaviour we presented in Example 1.

One might argue that Ψ in Example 2 is not modelled adequately, because $\text{Mod}(\Psi)$ contains the unlikely world $z\bar{o}\bar{t}$. However, it seems very natural that agents might come up with irrational beliefs for several reasons, but revision should be one of the processes to transform these irrational beliefs (in the light of new information) into rational beliefs.

The class of dynamic-limited revision operators provides a large variety of scopes which obey single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness.

Theorem 15. Let $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$ be an epistemic state. The following two statements hold:

- For every consistent set X which satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness there exists a dynamic-limited revision operator \star with $\text{Scp}^\star(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup X$.
- If \star is an dynamic-limited revision operator, then $\text{Scp}^\star(\Psi)$ satisfies single-sentence closure. Moreover, the set $\text{Scp}^\star(\Psi) \setminus \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness.

5 Characterisation of \mathcal{S}_Ψ

In the following, we present a syntactic interpretation for the semantic concept of \mathcal{S}_Ψ for dynamic-limited revision operators. We show that these concepts conform to each other. Moreover, this connects the scope $\text{Scp}^\star(\Psi)$ and \mathcal{S}_Ψ .

Definition 16. Let \circ be a belief change operator and Ψ an epistemic state. For a belief $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ we define the following two conditions:

- (S1) If $\text{Bel}(\Psi) + \alpha$ is consistent, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \beta) \subseteq \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha)$ for all β with $\alpha \models \beta$.
- (S2) For all β , $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \beta) \subseteq \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha)$ implies consistency of $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \beta) + \alpha$.

Condition (S1) states that if α is consistent with the prior beliefs, then a change by a more general belief results in the beliefs of $\text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha)$ or fewer. Condition (S2) expresses (in the contrapositive version) that when changing by a belief α , which is inconsistent with the result of a change with a belief β , then the result will never contain all beliefs obtained by the change with β .

As first result, we obtain that conditions (S1) and (S2) allow to capture the interpretations in \mathcal{S}_Ψ .

Lemma 17. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with a limited assignment $\Psi \mapsto \preceq_\Psi$. The following holds:

- (a) If $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ iff φ_ω satisfies S1 in Ψ .
- (b) If $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ iff φ_ω satisfies S2 in Ψ .

In a broader sense, (S1) expresses that more specific beliefs consistent with prior beliefs restrict the potential beliefs after the change by more general beliefs. The condition (S2) states that when a belief results in more beliefs after revision, then this belief is compatible with the more specific belief set. This gives rise to the following two notions.

Definition 18. Let \circ be a belief change operator and Ψ an epistemic state. A belief $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ is called

- latent in Ψ if α and every consistent β with $\beta \models \alpha$ satisfies $S1$ and $S2$ in Ψ .
- reasonable in Ψ if $\alpha \equiv \alpha_1 \vee \dots \vee \alpha_n$ where each α_i is latent.

A belief set X is reasonable in Ψ if $\beta \equiv X$ is reasonable in Ψ .

The notions of latent and reasonable are helpful, as they capture those beliefs whose models are elements in \mathcal{S}_Ψ .

Proposition 19. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with a limited assignment $\Psi \mapsto \preceq_\Psi$. A belief α is reasonable in Ψ if and only if $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and α is consistent.

We can characterise the scope of a dynamic-limited revision operator by reasonable beliefs.

Theorem 20. For an epistemic state Ψ and dynamic-limited revision operator \star the following statements hold:

- Syntactically, the scope of \star and Ψ is given by:

$$\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha \mid \beta \models \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ is reasonable}\}$$
- If \star is compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$, then:

$$\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha \mid \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset\}$$

In the next section, we will use Proposition 19 to obtain a syntactic characterisation of the class of dynamic-limited revision operators.

6 Representation Theorem

In this section, we provide postulates for dynamic-limited revision operators and show that these postulates capture exactly the class of dynamic-limited revision operators. By employing the notion of reasonable beliefs, we propose the following postulates:

(DL1) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ or $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$

(DL2) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ or $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is reasonable in Ψ

(DL3) if $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha\}$ is consistent and α reasonable in Ψ , then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Cn}(\text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha\})$

(DL4) if $\alpha \models \beta$ and α is reasonable in Ψ , then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta)$ is reasonable in Ψ .

(DL5) if $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$ is consistent, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is consistent

(DL6) if $\alpha \equiv \beta$, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta)$

(DL7) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \begin{cases} \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) \text{ or} \\ \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta) \text{ or} \\ \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) \cap \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta) \end{cases}$

The postulates (DL1) and (DL6)–(DL7) are the same as the postulates (CL1), (CL4) and (CL6) for credibility-limited revision. By (DL2), the operator yields either the prior belief set or a reasonable belief set. The postulate (DL3) is a weaker form of the vacuity postulate (CL2), which limits vacuity to reasonable beliefs. Postulate (DL4) guarantees immanence of the result of the change by a belief β when β is more general than an reasonable belief α . By (DL5), the posterior belief set is guaranteed to be consistent, when the prior belief set is consistent. Clearly, (DL5) is related to (CL2), but note that credibility-limited revision

assumes consistency of $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$, an assumption we do not make for dynamic-limited revision operators. Note that the postulate (CL5) from credibility-limited revision is implied by (DL1)–(DL7).

Indeed, the postulates (DL1)–(DL7) capture exactly the dynamic-limited revision operators.

Theorem 21. A belief change operator \star is a dynamic-limited revision operator if and only if \star satisfies (DL1)–(DL7).

7 Iteration and Dynamic-Limited Revision

This section considers different iteration principles for dynamic-limited revision operators. We provide characterisation theorems for each principle.

Darwiche and Pearl Postulates. As a first result of this section, we investigate a semantic characterisation of Darwiche and Pearl postulates (DP1)–(DP4) for dynamic-limited revision operators.

Proposition 22. A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ satisfies (DP1) if and only if the following conditions hold:

(i) if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$

(ii) if $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$

otherwise $(\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$

(iii) if $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$

otherwise $(\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$

One might wonder how (DP1) can enforce such a complex behaviour when using dynamic-limited revision operators. The cause for this behaviour is given by the threefoldness of dynamic-limited revision operators. When considering two-step changes, for AGM revision the posterior belief set is determined by a total preorder (and the change of the order of elements), but for dynamic-limited revision operators, the result depends on $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$, the relation \preceq_Ψ , the set \mathcal{S}_Ψ and how these components evolve. For the same reason, we will obtain similar complex conditions when considering (DP2)–(DP4), (CLDP1), (CLDP2) and (CLP).

Proposition 23. A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ satisfies (DP2) if and only if the following conditions hold:

(i) if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$

(ii) if $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$

otherwise $(\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$.

(iii) if $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$

otherwise $(\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$.

Proposition 24. A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ satisfies (DP3) if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (i) if and $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$\omega_1 \prec_\Psi \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$
- (ii) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \prec_\Psi \omega_2$, then

$$\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
- (iii) if $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\Psi \models \alpha$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$
- (iv) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$(\omega_1 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \text{ or } \omega_2 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_1) \Rightarrow \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$

Proposition 25. A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ satisfies (DP4) if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (i) if and $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$\omega_1 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 \prec_\Psi \omega_2$$
- (ii) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_1$, then

$$\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \Rightarrow \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$
- (iii) if $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\Psi \not\models \neg \alpha$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$
- (iv) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$(\omega_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi \text{ or } \omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2) \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$

As Propositions 22 to Propositions 25 show, the postulates (DP1)–(DP4) do not only impose constraints on the order of interpretations (c.f. Proposition 6), they also impose constraint on the \mathcal{S}_Ψ . Therefore, by Proposition 20, these postulates constrains indirectly scope $Scp^*(\Psi)$. However, Propositions 22 to Propositions 25 are rather technical, and we think that the results demonstrate that modified versions of the Darwiche and Pearl postulates, like the ones represented in Section 3, are more suitable for dynamic-limited revision operators.

Monotonic dynamics of \mathcal{S}_Ψ and $Scp^*(\Psi)$. We continue by characterising monotonic change of \mathcal{S}_Ψ and $Scp^*(\Psi)$.

From Proposition 19 we obtain the following observation:

Corollary 26. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. The following statements hold:

- (a) $\mathcal{S}_\Psi \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ if and only if the following holds:
 if β is reasonable in Ψ , then β is reasonable in $\Psi \star \alpha$
- (b) $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ if and only if the following holds:
 if β is reasonable in $\Psi \star \alpha$, then β is reasonable in Ψ

By Proposition 20, the set \mathcal{S}_Ψ encodes semantically the beliefs of $Scp^*(\Psi)$ which are not part of the belief set. This gives rise to the following proposition.

Proposition 27. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. Then,

- (a) $Scp^*(\Psi) \subseteq Scp^*(\Psi \star \alpha)$ if and only if the following holds:
 - (SI1) if $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$,
 then $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \neq \emptyset$ or $\Psi \star \alpha \models \beta$
 - (SI2) if $\Psi \models \beta$ and $\Psi \star \alpha \not\models \beta$, then $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \neq \emptyset$
- (b) $Scp^*(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq Scp^*(\Psi)$ if and only if the following holds:
 - (SD1) if $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \neq \emptyset$,
 then $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ or $\Psi \models \beta$
 - (SD2) if $\Psi \star \alpha \models \beta$ and $\Psi \not\models \beta$, then $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$

Iteration Principles considering the Scope. We consider further iteration principles from Section 3 and characterise them for dynamic-limited revision operators. By this approach the insightful Proposition 15 is very helpful.

Proposition 28. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. Then the following statements hold:

- \star satisfies (CLDP1) if and only for all ω_1, ω_2 with $\varphi_{\omega_1} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1})$ and $\varphi_{\omega_2} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_2})$ the conditions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 22 hold.
- \star satisfies (CLDP2) if and only if for all ω_1, ω_2 with $\varphi_{\omega_1} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1})$ and $\varphi_{\omega_2} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_2})$ the conditions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 23 hold.

A closer look at Proposition 28 points out that (CLDP1) and (CLDP2) are unsatisfactory postulates for general dynamic-limited revision operators, because they seem to intermingle concepts of scope dynamics and belief dynamics. As an alternative to (CLDP1) and (CLDP2), we consider the following two postulates:

- (DLDP1) if $\beta \models \alpha$ and α, β are reasonable in Ψ ,
 then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta)$
- (DLDP2) if $\beta \models \neg \alpha$ and α, β are reasonable in Ψ ,
 then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta)$

By Corollary 26 we obtain the following result.

Proposition 29. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. Then the following statements hold:

- \star satisfies (DLDP1) if and only if for $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ with $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ we have $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$.
- \star satisfies (DLDP2) if and only if for $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\neg \alpha)$ with $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ we have $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$.

For the postulate (CLP) we obtain a result similar to Proposition 28.

Proposition 30. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. Then \star satisfies (CLP) if and only if the following conditions holds for all ω_1, ω_2 with $\varphi_{\omega_1} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1})$ and $\varphi_{\omega_2} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_2})$:

- (i) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$
- (ii) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$, then:

$$\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
- (iii) if $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\Psi \not\models \neg \alpha$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$
- (iv) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$(\omega_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi \text{ or } \omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2) \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$

Proposition 31. Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. Then the following equivalences hold:

- \star satisfies (CLCD) if and only if:
 - if $\beta \models \neg \alpha$ and $\Psi \star \alpha \models \alpha$ and $\Psi \star \beta \not\models \beta$,
 then $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} = \emptyset$
- \star satisfies (CM1) if and only if:
 - if $\beta \models \alpha$ and $\Psi \star \beta \models \beta$ or $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$,
 then $\Psi \star \alpha \models \beta$ or $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \neq \emptyset$

- \star satisfies (CM2) if and only if:

$$\text{if } \beta \models \neg\alpha \text{ and } \Psi \star \alpha \models \alpha \text{ and } \Psi \star \beta \models \beta, \\ \text{then } \Psi \star \alpha \models \beta \text{ or } \text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \neq \emptyset$$

As a consequence of Proposition 20 and Proposition 27, we obtain the following result:

Proposition 32. *Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. Then the following equivalences holds:*

- \star satisfies (FC) if and only if for each α with $\Psi \star \alpha \not\models \alpha$ holds (SI1) and (SI2).
- \star satisfies (FR) if and only if for each α with $\Psi \star \alpha \not\models \alpha$ holds (SD1) and (SD2).
- \star satisfies (SC) if and only if for each α with $\Psi \star \alpha \models \alpha$ holds (SI1) and (SI2).
- \star satisfies (SR) if and only if for each α with $\Psi \star \alpha \models \alpha$ holds (SD1) and (SD2).

Proposition 33. *Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. Then the following equivalences holds:*

- \star satisfies (DOC) if and only if the following two statements hold:
 - if $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ and $\beta \models \neg\alpha$, then $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$
 - if $\Psi \models \alpha$ and $\beta \models \neg\alpha$, then $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$
- \star satisfies (COM) if and only if the following holds:
 - if $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$ and $\Psi \not\models \alpha$, then $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$

8 Inherent and Immanent Beliefs

As an application for dynamic-limited revision operators, we define the concept of immanent beliefs, which are always credible and fundamentally plausible for the agent when revising. Therefore we assume that these immanent beliefs are rooted in fundamental building-blocks of the mind when forming a new belief set. We call these building-blocks ‘inherent beliefs’. It seems plausible that a (non-prioritised) belief revision operator encodes the attitude towards these beliefs by accepting them regardless of the epistemic state.

Definition 34 (inherence, immanence). *Let \circ be a belief change operator. A belief α is called inherent (for \circ) if $\text{Cn}(\alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \circ \alpha)$ for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$. A belief α is called immanent (for \circ) if $\alpha \equiv \alpha_1 \vee \dots \vee \alpha_k$ such that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are inherent for \circ . A belief set X is called immanent (for \circ) if $X = \text{Cn}(\alpha)$ such that α is immanent for \circ .*

Intuitively, inherent beliefs are such beliefs that get accepted with all their consequences regardless of the current epistemic state. The notion of immanent beliefs covers beliefs that are composed of inherent beliefs.

Example 3. *Consider $\Sigma = \{e, f\}$, where e has the intended meaning ‘there is extraterrestrial life’ and f has the intended meaning ‘it is a fictive story’. An agent might deny the possibility of extraterrestrial life, but she is open to fictitious stories. One might expect that $e \wedge f$ and $\neg e \wedge f$ may be inherent beliefs, $e \rightarrow f$ is an immanent belief and $\neg e \rightarrow f$ is no immanent belief.*

Relation to Belief Change Operators. For AGM revisions, the inherent beliefs are exactly the worlds, and thus for AGM revision operators there are no non-immanent beliefs.

Proposition 35. *Let \mathcal{E} be unbiased. For every AGM revision operator \star every consistent belief is immanent, and a belief $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ is inherent if and only if it has exactly one model.*

We obtain the following result about inherent and immanent beliefs for credibility-revision operators.

Proposition 36. *Let \ast be a credibility-limited revision operator and $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, C_\Psi)$ be a corresponding CLF-assignment. A belief α is inherent for \ast if and only if α has exactly one model ω and $\omega \in C_\Psi$ for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$. Therefore, there is a credibility-limited revision operator with no immanent and no inherent beliefs.*

For dynamic-limited revision operators, inherent beliefs are limited by the domain of every epistemic state.

Proposition 37. *Let \mathcal{E} be unbiased, and $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$ a limited assignment compatible with a dynamic-limited revision operator \star . If α is inherent, then either $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ or $\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) = \emptyset$. Moreover, in the latter case $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\alpha)$.*

Inherence-Limited Revision Operators We design and characterise a new class of belief change operators, called inherence-limited revision operators, which yield either an immanent belief set or does not change the belief set. We start by defining the inherence-limited revision operators by postulates about their belief dynamics.

Definition 38. *A belief change operator \ast is an inherence-limited revision operator if \ast satisfies:*

- (IL1) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ or $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha)$
- (IL2) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ or $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha)$ is immanent
- (IL3) if $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha\}$ is consistent and α immanent, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha) \cup \{\alpha\} = \text{Cn}(\text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha\})$
- (IL4) if $\alpha \models \beta$ and α is immanent, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \beta)$ is immanent.
- (IL5) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha)$ is inconsistent only if $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$ is inconsistent
- (IL6) if $\alpha \equiv \beta$, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \beta)$
- (IL7) $\text{Bel}(\Psi \ast (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \begin{cases} \text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha) \text{ or} \\ \text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \beta) \text{ or} \\ \text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \alpha) \cap \text{Bel}(\Psi \ast \beta) \end{cases}$

Clearly, the postulates are inspired by those for dynamic-limited revision operators. Thus, for their explanation we refer to Section 6.

Every model of an immanent belief of an inherence-limited revision operator is inherent.

Lemma 39. *Let \ast be an inherence-limited revision operator. If α is immanent for \ast , then $\varphi_\omega \models \alpha$ is inherent for \ast .*

From the postulates of inherence-limited revision operators we obtain the following result.

Lemma 40. *Let \ast be an inherence-limited revision operator. If $\alpha \in \text{Scp}^\ast(\Psi) \setminus \text{Bel}(\Psi)$, then α is immanent.*

Lemma 39, Lemma 40 and Definition 34 gives rise to the following representation theorem for inherence-limited revision operators.

Ψ	Ψ_{i1}^1	$\Psi_{i1}^1 * a$	$\Psi_{i1}^1 * (a \wedge b)$	Ψ_{i1}^2	$\Psi_{i1}^2 * (a \wedge b)$
$\text{Mod}(\Psi)$	$ab, \bar{a}\bar{b}$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$	$ab, \bar{a}\bar{b}$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$
\mathcal{S}_Ψ	$\bar{a}\bar{b}, ab$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}, ab$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}, ab$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}, ab$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}, ab$
\preceq_Ψ	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$	$\bar{a}\bar{b}$
	ab	ab	ab	ab	ab

Figure 1: An inference-limited revision operator $*$.




Figure 2: Interrelation between the operator classes.

Theorem 41. *A belief change operator $*$ is an inference-limited revision operator if and only if $*$ is a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$ such that there is $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ with $\mathcal{S}_\Psi = \Omega'$ for every epistemic states Ψ .*

We give an example for inference-limited revision operators.

Example 4. *Consider $*$ and the epistemic states Ψ_{i1}^1 and Ψ_{i1}^2 which satisfy the conditions from Figure 1. While the change from Ψ_{i1}^1 to $\Psi_{i1}^1 * (a \wedge b)$ suggests that $a \wedge b$ is an inherent or immanent belief, the change from Ψ_{i1}^2 to $\Psi_{i1}^2 * (a \wedge b)$ proves this wrong, because $a \wedge b \notin \text{Bel}(\Psi_{i1}^2 * (a \wedge b))$. This is because $a \wedge b$ has no inherent model. Thus, when invoking $*$ by $a \wedge b$, in both states Ψ_{i1}^1 and Ψ_{i1}^2 the belief set is kept. However, the belief $a \wedge \neg b$ could be inherent. Consider the change from Ψ_{i1}^1 to $\Psi_{i1}^1 * a$. Here a and the belief base of Ψ_{i1}^1 are not inconsistent, i.e. $\text{Mod}(a) \cap \text{Mod}(\Psi_{i1}^1) = \{ab\} \neq \emptyset$. We obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi_{i1}^1 * a) = \{\bar{a}\bar{b}\} = \min(\text{Mod}(a), \preceq_{\Psi_{i1}^1})$, since $a \wedge b$ is no immanent belief and therefore (IL3) is not applicable. In all these changes the set \mathcal{S}_Ψ remains the same, respectively the domains of the assigned total preorder do not alter.*

From Proposition 15 and Theorem 41 we obtain the following result.

Proposition 42. *For every inference-limited revision operator $*$ there exist a set $X \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ which satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness such that $\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup X$ for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$.*

As a last result, we show that the classes of credibility-limited revision operators and inference-limited revision operators are disjoint except for AGM revision operators. Their relation is also illustrated in Figure 2.

Proposition 43. *Let \mathcal{E} be unbiased. A belief change operator \circ is an inference-limited revision operator and a credibility-limited revision operator at the same time if and only if \circ is an AGM revision operator.*

9 Summary and Future Work

In this article we investigated dynamic-limited revision operators, which are operators that maintain a total preorder over an arbitrary set of worlds. We considered the concept of scope, which describes those beliefs which get accepted by a (non-prioritized) revision operator. Different postulates for dynamics of beliefs and the scope were considered and novel postulates were introduced. We gave representation theorems for all these postulates for dynamic-limited revision operators.

As an application, we introduced immanent and inherent beliefs as global properties of an operator. The notion of immanent beliefs provides rationale to the inference-limited revision operators. We have presented a representation theorem for inherent revision operators. Credibility-limited revisions and inference-limited revision operators are elements of the class of dynamic-limited revision operators which are a common generalisation. We showed that inference-limited revision and credibility-limited revision operators are disjoint except for the AGM revision operators.

For future work, we see that further investigations on postulates for the dynamics of the scope could be fruitful. In particular, the connections between scope dynamics and the results by Booth and Meyer (2011) on the dynamics of total preorders are open to explore. Moreover, the connections between immanent beliefs and *core beliefs* by Booth (Booth 2002) and the revision thereof should be elaborated.

The dynamic-limited revision operators follow the idea of credibility-limited revisions by keeping the prior belief set when dealing with inputs which have no models in the domain of the corresponding total preorder. Another approach open to investigate would be to accept the input as it is. This would yield operators which behave according to the following scheme (or variants thereof):

$$\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \begin{cases} \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) & \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) \neq \emptyset \\ \text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) & \text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \neq \emptyset \\ \text{Mod}(\alpha) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Another application is composition of operators for the separation of the epistemic state into substructures, e.g. for complexity purposes (Liberatore 1997; Schwind et al. 2020) or syntax splitting techniques (Peppas et al. 2015; Kern-Isberner and Brewka 2017).

Furthermore, belief revision is often connoted as a theory to describe rational change, thus, the theory is used normatively. However, in research like the cognitive logics approach (Ragni et al. 2020) the human reasoner are the norm. By this point of view, logic and belief revision operators are tools to describe the mechanisms of human and real world reasoning. We think that flexible formalisms, like the dynamic-limited revision and inference-limited revision operators presented here, are useful for such investigations.

References

- Alchourrón, C. E.; Gärdenfors, P.; and Makinson, D. 1985. On the logic of theory change: Partial meet contraction and revision functions. *J. Symb. Log.* 50(2):510–530.
- Booth, R., and Meyer, T. A. 2006. Admissible and restrained revision. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* 26:127–151.
- Booth, R., and Meyer, T. A. 2011. How to revise a total preorder. *J. Philos. Log.* 40(2):193–238.
- Booth, R.; Fermé, E.; Konieczny, S.; and Pino Pérez, R. 2012. Credibility-limited revision operators in propositional logic. In Brewka, G.; Eiter, T.; and McIlraith, S. A., eds., *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning: Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference, KR 2012, Rome, Italy, June 10-14, 2012*, 116–125. AAAI Press.
- Booth, R.; Fermé, E. L.; Konieczny, S.; and Pino Pérez, R. 2014. Credibility-limited improvement operators. In Schaub, T.; Friedrich, G.; and O’Sullivan, B., eds., *ECAI 2014 - 21st European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 18-22 August 2014, Prague, Czech Republic*, volume 263 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, 123–128. IOS Press.
- Booth, R. 2002. On the logic of iterated non-prioritized revision. In Kern-Isberner, G.; Rödder, W.; and Kulmann, F., eds., *Conditionals, Information, and Inference, International Workshop, WCII 2002, Hagen, Germany, May 13-15, 2002, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3301 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 86–107. Springer.
- Darwiche, A., and Pearl, J. 1997. On the logic of iterated belief revision. *Artificial Intelligence* 89:1–29.
- Falakh, F. M.; Rudolph, S.; and Sauerwald, K. 2021. A general katsuno-mendelzon-style characterization of AGM belief base revision for arbitrary monotonic logics. *CoRR* abs/2104.14512.
- Garapa, M.; Fermé, E.; and Reis, M. D. L. 2018. Studies in credibility-limited base revision. In Thielscher, M.; Toni, F.; and Wolter, F., eds., *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning: Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference, KR 2018, Tempe, Arizona, 30 October - 2 November 2018.*, 240–247. AAAI Press.
- Hansson, S. O.; Fermé, E. L.; Cantwell, J.; and Falappa, M. A. 2001. Credibility limited revision. *J. Symb. Log.* 66(4):1581–1596.
- Hansson, S. O. 1999. A survey of non-prioritized belief revision. *Erkenntnis* 50(2):413–427.
- Jin, Y., and Thielscher, M. 2007. Iterated belief revision, revised. *Artif. Intell.* 171(1):1–18.
- Kern-Isberner, G., and Brewka, G. 2017. Strong syntax splitting for iterated belief revision. In Sierra, C., ed., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2017, Melbourne, Australia, August 19-25, 2017*, 1131–1137. ijcai.org.
- Konieczny, S., and Pino Pérez, R. 2008. Improvement operators. In Brewka, G., and Lang, J., eds., *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference, KR 2008, Sydney, Australia, September 16-19, 2008*, 177–187. AAAI Press.
- Konieczny, S.; Grespan, M. M.; and Pino Pérez, R. 2010. Taxonomy of improvement operators and the problem of minimal change. In Lin, F.; Sattler, U.; and Truszczyński, M., eds., *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference, KR 2010, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, May 9-13, 2010*. AAAI Press.
- Liberatore, P. 1997. The complexity of iterated belief revision. In Afrati, F. N., and Kolaitis, P. G., eds., *Database Theory - ICDT '97, 6th International Conference, Delphi, Greece, January 8-10, 1997, Proceedings*, volume 1186 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 276–290. Springer.
- Peppas, P.; Williams, M.; Chopra, S.; and Foo, N. Y. 2015. Relevance in belief revision. *Artif. Intell.* 229:126–138.
- Ragni, M.; Kern-Isberner, G.; Beierle, C.; and Sauerwald, K. 2020. Cognitive logics – features, formalisms, and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI 2020*. IOS Press. (accepted for publication).
- Sauerwald, K., and Beierle, C. 2019. Decrement operators in belief change. In Kern-Isberner, G., and Ognjanović, Z., eds., *Proceedings of the 15th European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning with Uncertainty ECSQARU 2019*, LNAI.
- Schwind, N., and Konieczny, S. 2020. Non-Prioritized Iterated Revision: Improvement via Incremental Belief Merging. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, 738–747.
- Schwind, N.; Konieczny, S.; Lagniez, J.; and Marquis, P. 2020. On computational aspects of iterated belief change. In Bessière, C., ed., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2020*, 1770–1776.

Supplementary Material: Proofs

We will make use of the following two lemma.

Lemma 44. *Let $X \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ such that every element of X is consistent. Then X satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness if and only if there is a set of interpretations $M \subseteq \Omega$ such that $X = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{L} \mid \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap M \neq \emptyset\}$.*

Proof. This has been shown implicitly by Hansson et al. (2001, Thm. 11). By their proof, M is given by the models of $\{\alpha \mid \neg\alpha \notin X\}$. \square

Lemma 45. *For a total preorder \preceq over a set X , and $A, B \subseteq X$, it holds either $\min(A \cup B, \preceq) = \min(A, \preceq)$ or $\min(A \cup B, \preceq) = \min(B, \preceq)$ or $\min(A \cup B, \preceq) = \min(A, \preceq) \cup \min(B, \preceq)$.*

Proof. Let $x_1, x_2 \in \min(X, \preceq)$. By totality of the order \preceq , we have $x_1 \preceq x_2$. Observe now that by transitivity of the order \preceq , we have $x_1 \in \min(X \cup Y, \preceq)$ if and only if $x_2 \in \min(X \cup Y, \preceq)$. This implies the claim. \square

In the following we present missing proofs for propositions from the paper.

Lemma 17. *Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with a limited assignment $\Psi \mapsto \preceq_\Psi$. The following holds:*

- (a) *If $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ if and only if φ_ω is S1 in Ψ .*
- (b) *If $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ if and only if φ_ω is S2 in Ψ .*

Proof. We show (a) and (b) independently.

Statement (a). Let $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ and thus $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \subseteq \text{Cn}(\varphi_\omega)$. If $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$, then by the faithfulness of \preceq_Ψ we obtain $\omega \in \min(\mathcal{S}_\Psi, \preceq_\Psi)$. This implies $\omega \in \min(\text{Mod}(\beta), \preceq_\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$ for β with $\omega \models \beta$. Therefore, φ_ω is S1.

If $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi$, then by the non-triviality of \star we obtain $\omega' \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Now choose $\omega \models \alpha$ where α chosen such that $\text{Mod}(\alpha) = \{\omega, \omega'\}$. We obtain that φ_ω is not S1, because application of Definition 13 yields $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) \not\subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$.

Statement (b). Let $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$.

We Consider the case of $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and show φ_ω is S2. Let β a formula such that $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$. If $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$, then $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ but $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. If $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$, then $\omega \notin \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$. Because $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$ we obtain $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta) \not\subseteq \text{Bel}(\text{arg1})$. Consequently, φ_ω is S2.

We Consider the case of $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and show φ_ω is not S2. If $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \emptyset$, then $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) + \varphi_\omega$ is inconsistent. Consequently, we obtain that φ_ω is not S2, because $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega)$. If $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \neq \emptyset$, then exist $\omega' \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. Because $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ we obtain $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega'}) + \varphi_\omega$ is inconsistent. From $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and Definition 13 obtain that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. Therefore, the formula φ_ω is not S2. \square

Proposition 19. *Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with a limited assignment $\Psi \mapsto \preceq_\Psi$. A belief α is reasonable in Ψ if and only if $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and α is consistent.*

Proof. By definition for every $\omega \models \alpha$ we obtain that φ_ω is latent. From Lemma 17 we obtain that $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Therefore $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$.

Now let α a formula such that $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. If $\text{Bel}(\Psi) + \alpha$ is consistent, then obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \min(\mathcal{S}_\Psi, \preceq_\Psi)$. Then for every β with $\alpha \models \beta$ we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$ by Definition 13. This shows that α is an S1 belief in Ψ . We show that α is S2 in Ψ . From $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$ obtain $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$. This yields immediately consistency of $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta) + \alpha$ and thus α is S2 in Ψ . \square

Theorem 20. *For an epistemic state Ψ and dynamic-limited revision operator \star the following statements hold:*

- *Syntactically, the scope of \star and Ψ is given by:*

$$\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha \mid \beta \models \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ is reasonable}\}$$

- *If \star is compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\prec_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$, then:*

$$\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha \mid \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset\}$$

We start by showing that $\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha \mid \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset\}$. By Definition 13, if α in $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$, then we have $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. Thus, we have $\alpha \in \text{Scp}^*(\Psi)$ for all $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi)$, i.e. $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \subseteq \text{Scp}^*(\Psi)$. For $\alpha \in \text{Scp}^*(\Psi) \setminus \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ we obtain $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ from Definition 13. Likewise, if $\alpha \notin \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ and $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$, then from Definition 13 we obtain $\alpha \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$.

As next step, we show $\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup \{\alpha \mid \beta \models \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ is reasonable}\}$. Observe that by Proposition 19 and Definition 13 we have that $\text{Mod}(\beta) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ for every reasonable belief β . Consequently, we obtain $\{\alpha \mid \beta \models \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ is reasonable}\} = \{\alpha \mid \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset\}$. This shows the claim.

Theorem 21. *A belief change operator \star is a dynamic-limited revision operator if and only if \star satisfies (DL1)–(DL7).*

Proof. The ‘ \Rightarrow ’-direction. Let \star be an operator satisfying the postulates (DL1)–(DL7). For Ψ , we construct $(\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ as follows, let \preceq_Ψ be the relation with $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ iff $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star (\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2}))$ and $\text{dom}(\preceq_\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \{\omega \mid \varphi_\omega \text{ is latent in } \Psi \text{ for } \star\}$. The relation \preceq_Ψ is a total preorder:

Totality/reflexivity. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Then by (DL7) we have that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star (\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2}))$ is equivalent to $\{\omega_1\}$ or $\{\omega_2\}$ or $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$. Therefore, the relation must be total. Reflexivity follows from totality.

Transitivity. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ with $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ and $\omega_2 \preceq_\Psi \omega_3$. Towards a contradiction assume that $\omega_1 \not\preceq_\Psi \omega_3$ holds. This implies $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_3}) = \{\omega_3\}$. Now assume that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3}) = \{\omega_3\}$. Then by (DL7) we obtain that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_2, \omega_3}) = \{\omega_3\}$, a contradiction to $\omega_2 \preceq_\Psi \omega_3$. Assume for the remaining case $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3}) \neq \{\omega_3\}$. We obtain from (DL7) that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3})$ equals either $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2})$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_3})$. Since the second case is impossible, $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ implies $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2})$. Now apply (DL7) again to $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3})$ and obtain that it is either equivalent to $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_3})$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_2})$. In both cases, we obtain a contradiction because $\omega_1, \omega_3 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3})$.

The construction yields a faithful limited assignment: We show $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \min(\Omega_\Psi, \preceq_\Psi)$. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. By definition of \mathcal{S}_Ψ the interpretations ω_1, ω_2 are latent in Ψ . Thus, the formula $\varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}$ is reasonable. From (DL3) we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}) = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ which yields by definition $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ and $\omega_2 \preceq_\Psi \omega_1$. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ with $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ and $\omega_2 \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. Then $\varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}$ is consistent with $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$. Therefore, by (DL3) and (DL5) we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}) = \{\omega_1\}$. Together we obtain faithfulness.

We show satisfaction of (limited-revision) in two steps:

For the first step, assume $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$. By the postulate (DL2) we have either $\text{Bel}(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ or $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is reasonable in Ψ . In the first case we are done. For the second case, by the postulate (DL1), we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Because $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is reasonable, the set $\text{Mod}(\alpha)$ contains an interpretation ω such that φ_ω is latent in Ψ , a contradiction to $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$.

For the second step assume $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$. We show the equivalence $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ by showing both set inclusions separately.

We show $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. Let $\omega \in \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ with $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. By construction of \mathcal{S}_Ψ the formula φ_ω is latent, and therefore reasonable. From postulate (DL4), we obtain that $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is reasonable in Ψ . Consequently, by Lemma 19, every interpretation in $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is latent in Ψ . Hence, there is at least one $\omega' \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ with $\omega' \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. If $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ we obtain $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ by the faithfulness of $\Psi \mapsto \preceq_\Psi$. If $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha) \neq \text{Bel}(\Psi)$, then by (DL1) we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Let $\beta = \varphi_\omega \vee \varphi_{\omega'}$ and $\gamma = \beta \vee \gamma'$ such that $\text{Mod}(\gamma) = \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and $\text{Mod}(\gamma') = \text{Mod}(\alpha) \setminus \{\omega, \omega'\}$. By (DL7) we have either $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \gamma')$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta) \cup \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \gamma')$. The first and the third case are impossible, because $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ and by the minimality of ω we have $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$. It remains the case of $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \gamma')$. Let $\omega_{\gamma'}$ such that $\omega_{\gamma'} \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. Note that $\omega_{\gamma'} \in \text{Mod}(\gamma') \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and $\omega_{\gamma'} \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Now let $\delta = \beta' \vee \delta'$ with $\delta \equiv \alpha$ such that $\text{Mod}(\beta') = \{\omega, \omega_{\gamma'}\}$ and $\text{Mod}(\delta') = \text{Mod}(\alpha) \setminus \{\omega, \omega_{\gamma'}\}$. By minimality of ω we have $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta')$. By (DL7) we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is either equivalent to $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta')$ or to $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \delta')$ or to $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta') \cup \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \delta')$. The first and third case are impossible since $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. Moreover, the second case is also impossible, because of $\omega_{\gamma'} \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \delta')$.

We show $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$. Let $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ with $\omega \notin \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$. From non-emptiness of $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ and $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ we obtain $\varphi_{\omega'}$ is latent in Ψ where $\omega' \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ such that $\omega' \in \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$.

Assume that φ_ω is not latent in Ψ , and therefore, $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. By the postulate (DL4) we obtain from the existence of ω' that $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is reasonable in Ψ . Therefore, by Lemma 39 every model in $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ is latent in Ψ , a contradiction, and therefore, φ_ω has to be latent in Ψ .

Because φ_ω is latent in Ψ we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$. Using the postulate (DL4) we obtain that $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \alpha)$

is reasonable in Ψ . Since ω is not minimal, we have $\omega' \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega, \omega'})$ and $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega, \omega'})$. Now let $\gamma = \varphi_{\omega, \omega'} \vee \gamma'$ with $\text{Mod}(\gamma') = \text{Mod}(\alpha) \setminus \{\omega, \omega'\}$. By (DL7) we have either $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta)$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \gamma')$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta) \cup \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \gamma')$. All cases are impossible because for every case we obtain $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. This shows $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$, and, in summary, we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ and thus, (limited-revision) holds.

The ‘ \leftarrow ’-direction. Let $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ be a dynamic-limited assignment compatible with \star . Note that by Lemma 19 for every model ω of an latent beliefs α we obtain that φ_ω is latent in Ψ . Moreover, φ_ω is latent in Ψ if $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$.

We show the satisfaction of (DL1)–(DL7). From (limited-revision) we obtain straightforwardly (DL1), (DL2), (DL5) and (DL6).

(DL3) Assume α to be reasonable in Ψ and $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. By Proposition 19 we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. From faithfulness of $\Psi \mapsto \preceq_\Psi$ we obtain $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$.

(DL4) Let $\alpha \models \beta$ and α reasonable. By Proposition 19 we have $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Then by (limited-revision) we obtain that $\text{Bel}(\Psi \star \beta)$ is reasonable.

(DL7) Suppose $\text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$, then by (limited-revision) for every formula γ with $\text{Mod}(\gamma) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta)$ we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \gamma)$.

Assume that $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$. Then by the postulate (limited-revision) we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. The case of $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$ and $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ is analogue.

Assume that $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$. Then we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta), \preceq_\Psi)$. Using logical equivalence, we obtain $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta), \preceq_\Psi) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cup \text{Mod}(\beta), \preceq_\Psi)$. By Lemma 45 we obtain directly (DL7). \square

Proposition 8. *For every AGM revision operator \star we have $\text{Scope}(\star, \Psi) = \mathcal{L}$ for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. A direct consequence of Proposition 2. \square

Proposition 9. *Let Ψ be an epistemic state. The following statements hold:*

- (a) *If \otimes is a credibility-limited revision operator, then $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \subseteq \text{Scp}^{\otimes}(\Psi)$, and $\text{Scp}^{\otimes}(\Psi)$ satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness.*
- (b) *For each $X \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $\text{Bel}(\Psi) \subseteq X$, and X satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness, there exist a credibility-limited revision operator \otimes such that $\text{Scp}^{\otimes}(\Psi) = X$.*

Proof (sketch). Remember that every credibility-limited revision operator \otimes is compatible with a CLF-assignment $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, C_\Psi)$. Clearly, by the semantic characterisation of the operator we have $\text{Scp}^{\otimes}(\Psi) = \{\alpha \mid \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap C_\Psi \neq \emptyset\}$. Employing Lemma 44 yields the statements. \square

Theorem 15. Let $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$ be an epistemic state. The following two statements hold:

- For every consistent set X which satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness exists a dynamic-limited revision operator \star with $\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi) \cup X$.
- If \star is an dynamic-limited revision operator, then $\text{Scp}^*(\Psi)$ satisfies single-sentence closure. Moreover, the set $\text{Scp}^*(\Psi) \setminus \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ satisfies single-sentence closure and disjunction completeness.

Proof. A consequence of (limited-revision) and Employing Lemma 44 yields the statements. \square

Proposition 22. A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ satisfies (DP1) if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (i) if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi$, then

$$\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$
- (ii) if $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
 otherwise

$$(\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
- (iii) if $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$
 otherwise

$$(\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$

Proof. The \Rightarrow direction. Assume \star satisfies (DP1). We show (i) to (iii).

(i). Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$. From (limited-revision) obtain that $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2})$ implies $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$. Consequently, by (DP1) obtain $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$.

(ii) Consider the case of $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)| \geq 2$. Suppose there is some $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ but $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$. Let $\omega' \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Observe that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$ and $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega'}) = \{\omega'\}$ by (limited-revision). If $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \neq \{\omega\}$, then from (limited-revision) and $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ follows $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_\omega) \neq \{\omega\}$ a contradiction to (DP1). If $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \{\omega\}$, then $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) = \{\omega\}$. Now let $\beta = \varphi_{\omega, \omega'}$. From faithfulness obtain that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta) = \{\omega\}$. The are two possibilities: $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta) = \{\omega\}$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta) = \{\omega'\}$. The latter case directly contradicts (DP1). The first case implies $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_{\omega'}) = \{\omega\}$ a contradiction to (DP1), because of $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega'}) = \{\omega'\}$.

Consider the case of $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)| < 2$. Suppose there is some $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ but $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \cup \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$. Then we obtain from (limited-revision) a contradiction to (DP1), because $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$ and $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_\omega) \neq \{\omega\}$.

(iii) Let $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and therefore $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$. If $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| < 2$ and $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) \neq \{\omega\}$. If $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| \geq 2$ and $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi$, then $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) \neq \{\omega\}$. A contradiction to (DP1) in both cases.

The \Rightarrow direction. We prove by contraposition and show that a violation of (i), (ii) or (iii) implies a violation of (DP1):

(i) If $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \not\Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$, then because of $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}) \neq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2})$ from (limited-revision).

(ii) Let $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Then, $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$ and $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Psi)$.

If $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)| \geq 2$, then let $\omega' \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ with $\omega' \neq \omega$. For $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \neq \{\omega\}$, we directly obtain a violation of (DP1). For $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \{\omega\}$ obtain that $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) = \{\omega\}$. Now observe that either $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_{\omega'}) = \{\omega'\}$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_{\omega'}) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$. In the first case we obtain that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega, \omega'}) \neq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_{\omega, \omega'})$. Likewise, the second case yields a violation of (DP1), because $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_{\omega'}) = \{\omega\} \neq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega'})$.

If $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)| < 2$ and $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$, then we directly obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \neq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega)$.

(iii) Let $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Then $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$ and $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. If $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| \geq 2$, or $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| < 2$ and $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$, then $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_\omega) \neq \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_\omega)$. \square

Proposition 23. A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ satisfies (DP2) if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (i) if $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi$, then

$$\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$
- (ii) if $|\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
 otherwise

$$(\mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
- (iii) if $|\text{Mod}(\Psi)| \geq 2$, then

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$
 otherwise

$$(\mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \cap \text{Mod}(\neg\alpha)) \setminus \text{Mod}(\Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$

Proof. Analogue to the proof of Proposition 22. \square

Proposition 24. A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega_\Psi)$ satisfies (DP3) if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (i) if and $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$\omega_1 \prec_\Psi \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$
- (ii) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \prec_\Psi \omega_2$, then

$$\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
- (iii) if $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\Psi \models \alpha$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$
- (iv) if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then

$$(\omega_1 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \text{ or } \omega_2 \preceq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_1) \Rightarrow \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$$

Proof. The " \Rightarrow " direction. We prove satisfaction of (i) – (iv) in the presence of (DP3):

(i) Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ with $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$, and $\omega_1 \prec_\Psi \omega_2$. From (limited-revision) and (DP3) we easily obtain $\omega_1 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$ by choosing $\beta = \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}$.

(ii) Assume $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ and $\omega_1 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$. Then for $\beta = \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}$ we obtain $\Psi \star \beta \models \alpha$ and $\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta \models \alpha$. A contradiction to (DP3).

(iii) Let $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ and $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$. From $\Psi \models \alpha$ and (limited-revision) obtain $\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega} \models \alpha$. But by $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ we obtain a contradiction to (DP3), because $\Psi \star \alpha \star \varphi_{\omega} \not\models \alpha$.

(iv) Suppose $\omega_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ and let $\beta = \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2}$. Both, $\omega_1 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$ or $\omega_2 \not\leq_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_1$, yields $\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta \not\models \alpha$ because of (limited-revision). From (DP3) obtain $\Psi \star \beta \not\models \alpha$. However, from $\omega_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ and $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ we obtain $\Psi \star \beta \models \alpha$.

The “ \Leftarrow ” direction. Let $\Psi \star \beta \models \alpha$. We show $\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta \models \alpha$. Towards a contradiction, assume $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta)$ with $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\alpha)$.

Consider the case of $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$. If $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$, then by $\Psi \star \beta \models \alpha$ there exist $\omega' \models \beta \wedge \alpha$ with $\omega' \prec_{\Psi} \omega$. From (i) and (ii) obtain the contradiction $\omega' \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega$. Having $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ and $\Psi \models \alpha$ at the same time is impossible by (iii). From $\Psi \not\models \alpha$ obtain that $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta) = \min(\text{Mod}(\beta), \leq_{\Psi})$ and therefore there exist $\omega' \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ with $\omega' \in \text{Mod}(\alpha \wedge \beta)$. From (i) and (iv) obtain the contradiction $\Psi \star \beta \not\models \alpha$.

Consider the case of $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$. Then obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha \star \beta)$ from (limited-revision). Because of $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha)$ we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ and $\Psi \not\models \alpha$. We obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \beta) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ as consequence. Because $\Psi \star \beta \models \alpha$ there exists $\omega' \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ with $\omega' \models \alpha \wedge \beta$. This contradicts $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. \square

Proposition 25. *A dynamic-limited revision operator \star compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\leq_{\Psi}, \Omega_{\Psi})$ satisfies (DP4) if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (i) *if and $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then*

$$\omega_1 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 \prec_{\Psi} \omega_2$$
- (ii) *if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_1$, then*

$$\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \Rightarrow \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$$
- (iii) *if $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\Psi \not\models \neg \alpha$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$*
- (iv) *if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ and $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then*

$$(\omega_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \text{ or } \omega_1 \not\leq_{\Psi} \omega_2) \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$

Proof. Analogue to the proof of Proposition 24. \square

Proposition 30. *Let \star be a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\leq_{\Psi}, \mathcal{S}_{\Psi})$. Then \star satisfies (CLP) if and only if the following conditions holds for all ω_1, ω_2 with $\varphi_{\omega_1} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_1})$ and $\varphi_{\omega_2} \in \text{Bel}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega_2})$:*

- (i) *if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then*

$$\omega_1 \leq_{\Psi} \omega_2 \Rightarrow \omega_1 \prec_{\Psi \star \alpha} \omega_2$$
- (ii) *if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \leq_{\Psi} \omega_2$, then:*

$$\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$
- (iii) *if $\omega \not\models \alpha$ and $\Psi \not\models \neg \alpha$, then $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha} \Rightarrow \omega \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$*
- (iv) *if $\omega_1 \models \alpha$ and $\omega_2 \not\models \alpha$ and $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ and $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$, then*

$$(\omega_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \text{ or } \omega_1 \not\leq_{\Psi} \omega_2) \Rightarrow \omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\Psi \star \alpha}$$

Proof. Analogue to the proof of Proposition 24. \square

Proposition 35. *Let \mathcal{E} be unbiased. For every AGM revision operator \star every consistent belief is immanent, and a belief $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ is inherent if and only if it has exactly one model.*

Proof. For every consistent belief set L there exists at least one state Ψ having this belief set, i.e., $\text{Bel}(\Psi) = L$. For $\omega \in \Omega$, regardless of the state, we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \varphi_{\omega}) = \{\omega\}$ due to Proposition 2. Thus, every φ_{ω} is an inherent belief with exactly one model. Assume now that $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ has two or more models. Let $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Then there is some belief set $\text{Mod}(L)$ with $\text{Mod}(L) = \text{Mod}(\alpha) \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Because L is consistent and \mathcal{E} unbiased, there is some state $\Psi_L \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\text{Bel}(\Psi_L) = L$. By Proposition 2, we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \text{Mod}(L)$. Thus, α is no inherent belief. As φ_{ω} for every $\omega \in \Omega$ is inherent, every consistent belief is immanent. \square

Proposition 36. *Let \star be a credibility-limited revision operator and $\Psi \mapsto (\leq_{\Psi}, C_{\Psi})$ be a corresponding CLF-assignment. A belief α is inherent for \star if and only if α has exactly one model ω and $\omega \in C_{\Psi}$ for every $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$. Therefore, there is a credibility-limited revision operator with no immanent and inherent beliefs.*

Proof. If α has more than one model, then by (CL2) it is no inherent belief when coosing Ψ with $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \subsetneq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Likewise by Equation (CLR) and (CL2) the condition $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq C_{\Psi}$ for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$ is easy to see.

For the last statement, choose a CLF-assignment $\Psi \mapsto (\leq_{\Psi}, C_{\Psi})$ with $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = C_{\Psi}$ for every epistemic state Ψ . \square

Proposition 37. *Let \mathcal{E} be unbiased, and $\Psi \mapsto (\leq_{\Psi}, \mathcal{S}_{\Psi})$ a limited assignment compatible with a dynamic-limited revision operator \star . If α is inherent, then either $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) = \emptyset$. Moreover, in the latter case $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Let α be an inherent belief of \circ and let $\Psi \in \mathcal{E}$ an arbitrary epistemic state, with $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k\}$. Assume ω such that $\omega \models \alpha$, but $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_{\Psi}$. If $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$, then by Definition 13 we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) \subsetneq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. This is a contradiction, because α is inherent. Consequently, we obtain $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi} \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) = \emptyset$. Moreover, because α is inherent, we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. \square

Lemma 39. *Let \star be an inherence-limited revision operator. If α is immanent for \circ , then every $\varphi_{\omega} \models \alpha$ is inherent for \circ .*

Proof. Let α and φ_{ω} be as above. Let Ψ be such that $\text{Mod}(\Psi) = \{\omega\}$. By (IL3), we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi \star \alpha) = \{\omega\}$. From (IL4) we obtain that $\text{Cn}(\varphi_{\omega})$ is an inherent belief set. This implies that φ_{ω} is inherent. \square

Theorem 41. *A belief change operator \star is an inherence-limited revision operator if and only if \star is a dynamic-limited revision operator compatible with $\Psi \mapsto (\leq_{\Psi}, \mathcal{S}_{\Psi})$ such that there is $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ with $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi} = \Omega'$ for every epistemic states Ψ .*

Proof. The ‘ \Rightarrow ’-direction. Let $*$ be an operator satisfying the postulates (IL1)–(IL7). For Ψ , we construct $(\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$. In particular, let \preceq_Ψ be the relation with $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ iff $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * (\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2}))$ and $\mathcal{S}_\Psi = \text{dom}(\preceq_\Psi) = \{\omega \mid \varphi_\omega \text{ is inherent for } *\}$. By the definition of inherence, \mathcal{S}_Ψ is the same for each Ψ , i.e. for every $\Psi, \Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$ we have $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ if and only if $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Gamma$. The order \preceq_Ψ is a total preorder:

Totality/reflexivity. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Then by (IL7) we have that $\text{Mod}(\Psi * (\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2}))$ is equivalent to $\{\omega_1\}$ or $\{\omega_2\}$ or $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$. Therefore, the relation must be total. Reflexivity follows from totality.

Transitivity. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ with $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ and $\omega_2 \preceq_\Psi \omega_3$. Towards a contradiction assume that $\omega_1 \not\preceq_\Psi \omega_3$ holds. This implies $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_3}) = \{\omega_3\}$. Now assume that $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3}) = \{\omega_3\}$. Then by (IL7) we obtain that $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_2, \omega_3}) = \{\omega_3\}$, a contradiction to $\omega_2 \preceq_\Psi \omega_3$. Assume for the remaining case $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3}) \neq \{\omega_3\}$. We obtain from (IL7) that $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3})$ equals either $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2})$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_3})$. Since the second case is impossible, $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ implies $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2})$. Now apply (IL7) again to $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3})$ and obtain that it is either equivalent to $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_3})$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_2})$. In both cases, we obtain a contradiction because $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3})$.

The construction yields a faithful limited assignment:

We show $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \min(\Omega, \preceq_\Psi)$. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. By definition of \mathcal{S}_Ψ the interpretations ω_1, ω_2 are inherent. From (IL3) we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi * (\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2})) = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ which yields by definition $\omega_1 \preceq_\Psi \omega_2$ and $\omega_2 \preceq_\Psi \omega_1$. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ with $\omega_1 \in \text{Mod}(\Psi)$ and $\omega_2 \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi)$. Then $\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2}$ is consistent with $\text{Bel}(\Psi)$. Therefore, by (IL3) and (IL5) we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi * (\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2})) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\varphi_{\omega_1} \vee \varphi_{\omega_2}) = \{\omega_1\}$. Together we obtain faithfulness.

We show the satisfaction of (limited-revision) in two case.

For the first case, assume $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$. By the postulate (IL2) we have either $\text{Bel}(\Psi) = \text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha)$ or $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha)$ is immanent. In the first case we are done. For the second case, by the postulate (IL1), we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Thus, by Lemma 39 the set $\text{Mod}(\alpha)$ contains an interpretation ω such that φ_ω is inherent, a contradiction to $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$.

For the second case assume $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$. We show the equivalence $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ by showing both set inclusions separately.

We show $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$. Let $\omega \in \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ with $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$. By construction of \mathcal{S}_Ψ and (IL3) we have $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_\omega)$. From Lemma 37 and Lemma 39 and postulate (IL4), we obtain that $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha)$ is immanent and every $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$ is inherent. Hence, there is at least one $\omega' \in \text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha)$ with $\omega' \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. If $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Bel}(\Psi)$ we obtain by the faithfulness $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$. If $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha) \neq \text{Bel}(\Psi)$, then by (IL1) we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$. Let $\beta = \varphi_\omega \vee \varphi_{\omega'}$ and $\gamma = \beta \vee \gamma'$ such that $\text{Mod}(\gamma) = \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and $\text{Mod}(\gamma') = \text{Mod}(\alpha) \setminus \{\omega, \omega'\}$. By (IL7) we have either $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta)$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \gamma')$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta) \cup \text{Mod}(\Psi * \gamma')$. The first and the third case

are impossible, because $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$ and by the minimality of ω we have $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta)$. It remains the case of $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \gamma')$. Let $\omega_{\gamma'}$ such that $\omega_{\gamma'} \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$. Note that $\omega_{\gamma'} \in \text{Mod}(\gamma') \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha)$ and $\omega_{\gamma'} \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. Now let $\delta = \beta' \vee \delta'$ with $\delta \equiv \alpha$ such that $\text{Mod}(\beta') = \{\omega, \omega_{\gamma'}\}$ and $\text{Mod}(\delta') = \text{Mod}(\alpha) \setminus \{\omega, \omega_{\gamma'}\}$. By minimality of ω we have $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta')$. By (IL7) we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$ is either equivalent to $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta')$ or to $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \delta')$ or to $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta') \cup \text{Mod}(\Psi * \delta')$. The first and third case are impossible since $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$. Moreover, the second case is also impossible, because of $\omega_{\gamma'} \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi * \delta')$.

We show $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) \subseteq \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$. Let $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$ with $\omega \notin \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$. From non-emptiness of $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ and $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$ we obtain an inherent belief $\varphi_{\omega'}$, where $\omega' \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$ such that $\omega' \in \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$.

Assume that φ_ω is not inherent, and therefore, $\omega \notin \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. By the postulate (IL4) we obtain from the existence of ω' that $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha)$ is immanent. Therefore, by Lemma 39 every model in $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$ is inherent, a contradiction, and therefore, φ_ω has to be inherent.

From inherence of φ_ω we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$. Using the postulate (IL4) we obtain that $\text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha)$ is immanent. Since ω is not minimal, we have $\omega' \in \text{Mod}(\Psi * (\varphi_{\omega, \omega'}))$ and $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi * (\varphi_{\omega, \omega'}))$. Now let $\gamma = \varphi_{\omega, \omega'} \vee \gamma'$ with $\text{Mod}(\gamma') = \text{Mod}(\alpha) \setminus \{\omega, \omega'\}$. By (IL7) we have either $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta)$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \gamma')$ or $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \beta) \cup \text{Mod}(\Psi * \gamma')$. All cases are impossible because for every case we obtain $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$. This shows $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) \subseteq \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$, and, in summary, we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi)$ and thus, (limited-revision) holds.

The ‘ \Leftarrow ’-direction. Let $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \mathcal{S}_\Psi)$ be a limited assignment compatible with $*$ such that $\mathcal{S}_\Psi = \mathcal{S}_\Gamma$ for all $\Psi, \Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$. Furthermore, let α be an inherent belief of $*$. Then by Lemma 37 every model ω of α is an element of \mathcal{S}_Ψ . Moreover, every φ_ω with $\omega \in \mathcal{S}_\Psi$ is an inherent belief.

We show the satisfaction of (IL1)–(IL7). From (limited-revision) we obtain straightforwardly (IL1), (IL2), (IL5) and (IL6).

(IL3) Assume α to be immanent and $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 37 we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$.

Thus, $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) \neq \emptyset$. From faithfulness we obtain $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha), \preceq_\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha)$.

(IL4) Let α be immanent and thus by Lemma 37 we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \cap \text{Mod}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Psi$. This implies $\alpha \models \beta$ and we obtain $\min(\text{Mod}(\beta), \preceq_\Psi) \neq \emptyset$. Then by (limited-revision) we obtain $\beta \in \text{Bel}(\Psi * \alpha)$.

(IL7) Suppose $\text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$, then by (limited-revision) for every formula γ with $\text{Mod}(\gamma) \subseteq \text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta)$ we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi * (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \text{Mod}(\Psi) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \gamma)$.

Assume that $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$. Then by the postulate (limited-revision) we obtain $\text{Mod}(\Psi * (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \text{Mod}(\Psi * \alpha)$. The case of $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi = \emptyset$ and $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ is analogue.

Assume that $\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{Mod}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{S}_\Psi \neq \emptyset$. Then we have $\text{Mod}(\Psi * (\alpha \vee \beta)) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta), \preceq_\Psi)$. Using logical equivalence, we obtain $\min(\text{Mod}(\alpha \vee \beta), \preceq_\Psi) = \min(\text{Mod}(\alpha) \cup \text{Mod}(\beta), \preceq_\Psi)$. By Lemma 45 we obtain directly (IL7). \square

Proposition 43. *Let \mathcal{E} be unbiased. A belief change operator \circ is an inference-limited revision operator and a credibility-limited revision operator at the same time if and only if \circ is an AGM revision operator.*

Proof. Because every faithful assignment is also a CLF-assignment and a faithful limited assignment, every AGM revision operator is also a credibility-limited revision operator and an inference-limited revision operator.

Let $*$ an inference-limited revision operator, but no AGM revision operator. Then there is an faithful limited assignment $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, \Omega')$ with $\Omega' \subsetneq \Omega$. Let Ψ_\top an epistemic state with $\text{Mod}(\Psi_\top) = \Omega$. Let α such that there is an $\omega \models \alpha$ with $\omega \notin \Omega'$. Then, because of (CL2), for every credibility-limited revision \otimes operator $\omega \in \text{Mod}(\Psi_\top \otimes \alpha)$, but $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Psi_\top * \alpha)$.

Let \otimes an credibility-limited revision operator, but no AGM revision operator. Then there is a CLF-assignment $\Psi \mapsto (\preceq_\Psi, C_\Psi)$ with $\text{Mod}(\Psi) \subseteq C_\Psi \subseteq \Omega$. Moreover, there is at least one $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}$ with $C_\Gamma \subsetneq \Omega$, i.e., there is $\omega \notin C_\Gamma$, and therefore, $\omega \notin \text{Mod}(\Gamma)$. Let again denote Ψ_\top an epistemic state with $\text{Mod}(\Psi_\top) = \Omega$. We obtain, because of (CL2), that $\text{Mod}(\Gamma \otimes \varphi_\omega) = \text{Mod}(\Gamma)$ and $\text{Mod}(\Psi_\top \otimes \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$. Assume that \otimes is also an inference-limited revision operator. From (IL2) and $\text{Mod}(\Psi_\top \otimes \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$ we obtain the immanence of φ_ω . Lemma 39 implies that φ_ω is inherent. This leads to the contradiction $\text{Mod}(\Gamma \otimes \varphi_\omega) = \{\omega\}$. \square